

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Research Consultations in Higher Education: A Case of Language Ideological Norm

Aliya Sikandar¹

Nasreen Hussain²

Maya Khemlani David³

Abstract

This qualitative case study research in ethnography aimed to investigate the notions of power and hegemony in research consultations around the construct of language ideologies. The study selected two MS (Education) research supervisees with their supervisors as two case studies. For the empirical exploration of the notions of power and hegemony in supervision practices, the study used the analytical approach of Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (1989; 2003). The findings of the study revealed how language became a source of power relations between the research participants. Language was a major concern in the consultation meetings, which became a source of establishing asymmetrical power relations between the participants. The case two was in a sharp contrast with case one in approach and style of supervision in its flexibility of supervision.

Keywords: Critical discourse analysis, Power, Hegemony, Research supervision, Language ideologies

1. Introduction

Research supervision is a very important function of higher education. It generally involves a discursive relationship between the supervisor and supervisee, as they are participants who are continually processing meanings, and negotiating aspects of power and identity in their texts (Ivanic, 1998; Lea, 1998; Lillis, 2001). The term 'supervision' suggests an unequal power relationship between the supervisor and supervisee (Maxwell & Smyth, 2011). According to the Macquarie dictionary (Delbridge, 1986), to supervise is to 'oversee (a process, work, workers etc) during execution or performance; superintend; have the oversight and direction of' (p. 629).

There is an element of power involved in supervisor's practices of reacting to students' writing (Lea & Street, 1998; Lillis, 2001). Studies in the field of research supervision explore students' and supervisors' misunderstandings and beliefs about the nature of feedback, issues of relationships between students and supervisors and identities of both the partners (Tuck, 2010). Another relevant study by Clughen and Connell (2012) look at the contestation of power and control between students and their supervisors in the supervisors' support provided to students in writing. Studies in the field also explain how meanings are negotiated differently between students and their supervisors in institutions (Lea and Street, 1998); variance in the interpretation of the writing task between them

¹ Associate Professor, Department of Communication and Languages, Institute of Business Management, Karachi

² Professor and Chair, Department of Communication and Languages, Institute of Business Management, Karachi

³ Honorary fellow of the Chartered Institute of Linguistics, UK

(Cohen, 1993; Lea, 1994; Street, 1995; Stierer, 1997); and a growing trend towards new dialogic approach in research supervision (Vehviläinen & Löfström, 2016).

The principle author's informal interactions with the MS students in a well-reputed private university of Pakistan gave her first-hand experience about the students' concerns regarding supervision. Students wanted that their voice should be heard but most of the time it was ignored by the supervisors. Students' informal discourses also expressed a deep concern about English language related issues which were a source of anxiety for them. Students felt that English language disadvantaged their position in relation to their supervisors. This could be a disenfranchisement of the student body as more power and control was extended to the supervisors of research. They could not express themselves freely and there was a sense of being limited in their expressions when discussing research with their supervisors because of English language.

Pakistan, with its four provinces, is ethnically, linguistically, and culturally a typical plural society, as no less than 24 major languages and a number of dialects are spoken here. Urdu is the declared national language, and English is the official language, and as such these are the dominant languages of the country. English is largely used in the domains of power like offices, press, media, education, and employment (Rahman 1996). Given the country's multilingual and multicultural make-up, deciding on the medium of instruction choice has never been easy at the level of political leadership or civil bureaucracy.

Due to disparity in education and medium of instruction, the student population faces innumerable difficulties in educational and professional forums. Those who have access to quality education in elite institutions have access to the language of power, which is English. The others do not get quality education mainly due to socio-economic factors, as English education is expensive. Inconsistencies in language policies & MOI obstructed education goals in Pakistan (Javed, 2017). The major entry into postgraduate levels is by students from public institutions. 70% of the Pakistani population get education through public institutions (Razzaq & Forde, 2014), where the medium of instruction is Urdu. It denied major part of the population access to good quality English language learning (Shamim, (2008). It divided the already class and caste-ridden society into the privileged and non-privileged groups (Rassool, 2007).

The context of the study is a private university of Pakistan, which is basically a business institute. The educational policies in higher education are formulated by the Higher Education Commission (HEC), Governing Board and the Academic Council. The MS program of Education is designed to equip the participants with essential knowledge and skills to lead organizational change and development. After successful completion of the course work, students are required to carry out research study for the thesis under the guidance of a research supervisor selected by the students and approved by the institute.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the notions of power and hegemony in research supervision meetings between the supervisors and supervisees around the construct of language ideologies. The aim of the study was to analyze the research supervisees' and their supervisors' "discourses" during the research consultations and

interviews. The study aimed to explore critical discrete moments in discourses in which power and domination were built discursively by the participants. Based on the background of the problem and the study purpose, the research question formulated was: What aspects of power and hegemony are embedded in research supervisees' and their supervisors' discourses in higher education around the construct of language ideologies?

2. Theoretical Background

The literature is selected to review the notions of hegemony and power in supervision, language ideologies and the affects of these factors on the discourses of the research supervisees. The section also discusses literature related to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as the analytical framework.

2.1 Power and Hegemony in Supervision

Research supervision in higher education is still an under explored area of study. Studies which are available on the notions of power and hegemony, yield how there is an unequal relation between the supervisor and supervisee. Teaching and learning practices and processes have been studied to understand how an instance of literary event effects students' writing (Heath, 1983), and how these practices are understood by student writers at local as well as wider societal level (Street, 2000). Major researchers in the field are Cope and Kalantzis (2000). Another relevant research theme is the building of students' relationship with the supervisors on the nature and content of feedback. The theme of student identities is also of utmost importance. These insights proved to be valuable for the writers in understanding supervision as a social practice.

Conversely, power and control in research supervision concerns controlling behaviour of the supervisors, which "pressure students to think, feel, or behave in a specific way" (Reeve, 2009; Vansteenkiste et al., 2010). Reeve (2009) suggests that the controlling behaviour of the supervisors begins from "the prioritization of the teacher's perspective" (p.161) which negates or discourages student's perspective. Another important aspect of supervisory practices concerns trust between the supervisors and supervisees. Trust had positive outcomes and less suspicious views of others (Weibel & Six, 2013). A mutual trust between the supervisor and supervisee encourages more social exchanges, risk taking and citizenship behaviours (Colquitt et al., 2007). Trust enables supervisors to provide autonomy, structure and involvement to their supervisees (Devos et al, 2015).

2.2 Language Ideology

Language ideology refers to a shared body of common beliefs, views and perceptions about language, which includes cultural assumptions about language, nature and purpose of communication, and patterns of communicative behaviour as an enactment of a collective order (Woolard, 1992). According to Tollefson (1999), language ideology tries to capture the implicit, usually unconscious assumptions about reality that fundamentally determine how human beings interpret events. Inspired mainly by the Marx-inspired works of Bakhtin and Voloshinov in the 20th century, contemporary interests of language ideology has been in studying aspects such as dialogue, voice, social struggles, and social contests. Oral and written texts are studied as means of transmission of ideologies in society, and studying these as indexicality or their social meanings (Blommaert, 2006). Language ideology has contributed significantly to the field of education in the

ethnographic tradition of linguistic anthropology (Cazden, & Hymes, 1972; Heath, 1983; Mehan, 1979; Philips, 1983). There have been research studies related to language ideology and identity in literacy (Levinson, 2005) and classroom practices (e.g. Rogers & Christian, 2007). Research shows that hierarchies are built in language classrooms on the basis of language ideologies, within languages (De Costa, 2010; Carreira, 2011) and between languages (Flores & Murillo, 2001; Mori, 2014; Luykx et. al., 2008; Volk & Angelova, 2007). There are studies on the cultural variability in education (Blommaert, 2006), for example student diversity in terms of their privileged or under-privileged educational backgrounds as a concern of identities.

2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

CDA contributes in understanding the power behind discourses-things which are not said or the veiled meanings of discourses (Fairclough, 1989). Texts cannot be viewed in isolation but in their contexts. This is what Fairclough refers to as “intertextuality” of discourses (1989). It positions certain people in more power, calls for a particular order of discourse, which is appropriate in a particular setting. The setting, space, subject and contents are the aspects of restraints upon participants as they use discourse in a particular manner. Besides, not all the users of the same language have access to all discourses. These constraints are related to position: who can access discourse in a particular environment, who has the capacity, knowledge, skills or education according to the situation, etc. There is social struggle in discourses, which includes accessing power or resisting power. Within qualitative research, this study is situated in the paradigm of critical research.

Noteworthy are the observations by the researchers in the field of CDA on power play of the supervisor. Studies in education and academic literacies explore students' and supervisors' misunderstanding and beliefs about the nature of feedback, issues of relationships between students and supervisors, and identities of both the partners. These insights guided the study to examine literary events as well as literary practices, and how students at local as well as wider societal level (Street, 2000) understand literacy practices. The relation between the supervisor and supervisee is that of power relations, and supervisees as well as supervisors are aware of asymmetrical power imbalance. Thus, adverse relations result in poor results in research work (van der Boom et. al., 2013).

In Pakistan, research supervision is quite an autonomous field, as different academic supervisors have a vastly different style of research supervision. CDA's critical stance on literacy brought invaluable insights in terms of theory and approach to this study by analyzing the discourses of power and hegemony in research consultation meetings. It could make visible the structures of dominance and control by the powerful counterparts, and suggested ways to eliminate power and hegemony in supervision.

There are various literacy studies related to student writing and the role of supervision in higher education, which have brought invaluable insights about literacy processes and practices. However, based on the literature available in the field of language ideologies and CDA, the writers are not aware to the best of their knowledge about any study in the field of language ideologies as a construct to inquire into the notions of power and authority in research consultation practices in higher education through the methodological framework of CDA.

3. Methodology

To study the notion of power and hegemony in research supervision the study selected two case studies of two research supervisees with their supervisors: Case 1 was a female supervisee with a female supervisor; case 2 was a male supervisee with a male supervisor. These cases were selected as purposive sampling to get two MS students of Education who were at the stage of thesis writing, so that the study could examine their discourses related to thesis development. For this, unstructured interviews and research consultation meetings between two MS (Education) students and their supervisors were selected within their contexts (a private university).

These two case studies tried to bring insider's perspective in the field of language ideologies. The uniqueness of this study is the depth of specific understanding of supervision processes and practices in this specific context. There was no attempt at generalization for larger audience and organizational studies.

The study followed Fairclough's triad structure of data analysis which includes: 1) The analysis of the linguistic structure, forms, and meanings of the text, that is, micro-analysis using the texts of students' research theses, 2) Discursive practices around the discourses of the participants in research consultations, that is the discursive practice of the participants in the context of the institutional context and 3) the sociocultural context in which these literacy processes occurred and within which resulting discourses circulated. As a method of analysis, Fairclough's CDA approach well-suited the purpose of this study to address and transform the social wrong of power and hegemony in supervision practices and processes, and a systematic manner of suppressing student voices.

Following Fairclough (2003), a relational view of discourses was adopted. There were several layers of analysis and an attempt was made to look at the relations between different levels of the categories, based on the transcripts of discourses (consultation meetings between the research participants and their supervisors).

The acronym *S* was used for the supervisor and *A* was used for the supervisee.

4. Findings and Discussion

The findings and discussion on the data are analyzed below. The case one initial meeting opened with the consultation focus on supervisee's first chapter and the supervisor read the thesis on the computer. The consultation meeting was entirely led by the supervisor and very little space was given to the supervisee to give her input. The meeting was largely led by questions asked by the supervisor:

1. *S: So was it ok? Did you follow? So what happened in this?*
2. *A: Design and implementation, design the whole course*
3. *S: The process of course development for the teacher? Okay stage 1 was planning, the course stage 2, was it modifying the course? Alright, so you planned the course?*
4. *A: hmm*
5. *S: And then you modified the course 2?*

As shown in lines 1, 2, 3 and 5, there were many clarifications sought by the supervisor. It was partly the supervision style and partly because the research writing was not clear to the supervisee. Because of the seeming deficiency in supervisee's research skills and writing skills, the supervisor had to stop reading repeatedly and ask for clarifications. The supervisor in her interview also expressed this aspect.

1. *S: it's not that they don't trust me I mean they definitely listen to me and you*
2. *know they are they they comply with the suggestions that I give*
3. *them but they don't trust themselves they don't have the confidence*

The concern of the supervisor explains the dilemma of the students: the educational background and research skills are poor at the MS level and this make their dependence on the supervisor even more crucial. This dependence explains how language is also molested by the affects of disempowerment. According to Fairclough (1989), language is a part of society; it is a social process and socially conditioned linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of society. There is an internal relationship between language and society, which is dialectical in nature. Since language is a part of society, linguistic aspects are social aspects.

Institutional regimentation of structure and control affected the structure of discourses. In these consultation meetings, the supervisor chose question-answer format. The consultation was a mix of consultation and teaching. The consultations were made up a number of queries, elicitations, clarifications, and comments. The particular feature about the meetings was the continued concern with the structure and organizational pattern of the thesis. The supervisee's low proficiency in English could be observed in her humble pronunciation patterns, broken sentence structure and grammatical errors.

Discourses were concerned with social conditions which were related to three different levels of social organization (Fairclough, 1989), which relates to the level of the social situation, the level of the social institution, and the level of society as a whole; it is the relationship between texts, processes and their social conditions. The discourses were largely affected by the structure and convention of the institution of power.

There was a continuous effort on the part of the supervisor to keep the discourses within the genre of research consultation. According to Cutting (2002), there are three types of contexts: The situational context, background knowledge context and co-textual context. Situational context refers here to the consultation meeting, to the immediate physical co-presence that is, the situation where the interaction was taking place at the time of speaking. Background knowledge refers to cultural norms. For instance, in the research consultation meetings, supervisees were expected to behave in a certain manner, dress in a formal manner and adhere to their supervisors' speech with respect. Supervisors, on the other hand, held power over their supervisees and they were expected to disseminate knowledge to them. Background knowledge can also refer to shared knowledge between interlocutors. As in cases one and two, both the interlocutors had the background knowledge of their subjects.

In contrast, in case two the meetings' various moves and strategies gave consultations a democratic, homogenous style. What was noteworthy was the absence of language concern, which was a predominant concern in case one. In case two, an absence of language concern was itself ideological. The supervisee spoke in Urdu throughout the meetings, whereas the supervisor switched codes between English and Urdu. They equated Urdu with eastern values and regarded it a symbol of nationalism; as a result, the supervisee felt empowered in using the national language. The voice of the supervisee was heard and was encouraged. It closely coincides with CDA's advocacy model to give voice and power to the marginalized groups, such as the supervisee. In the following excerpts, the supervisee's plight could be heard:

1. *A: I have seen since the past one and a half month this is happening, uhhh not*
2. *being able to concentrate on the analysis.*

He further added

1. *A: I can get involved in critical thinking. I get involved in that what could be the*
2. *problem, how to solve that problem The only problem is that of not getting down*
3. *to study, not being able to study.*

Fairclough's (1989) CDA analysis focuses on three levels (discussed in the methodology section). In the first level of analysis, i.e. description, the focus of CDA is on textual-linguistic features of data, such as grammar, vocabulary and cohesion. By studying the forms of language, one can discover the social processes and the specific ideology embedded in them. This study took relational approach to text analysis in the convention of Fairclough's text analysis (2003). The text is a source of meaning making by the responses of the interlocutors involved in a dialog. As suggested by Fairclough (2003), meaning making entails three analytically separable elements, which includes the production of the text, text itself and the reception of the text. As producers of the text, the focus is on the speakers; the reception of the text puts the focus on interpretation, on the interpreters, readers, or listeners.

The internal features of the text consisted of micro-textual analysis consisting of grammatical and lexical categories, which are mentioned below to understand the power relations between the participants.

The subjects and verbs were separated to find the auxiliary verbs, which express obligation, possibility, suggestion, probability or definitiveness of action. In case one the pattern of auxiliary verbs showed more directness in supervisor's statements owing to her powerful position

*can, should, I want to, I am, must
should be used, I have explained, I have seen, maybe you can say that*

1. *S: I would say modifying the existing course okay, So, you must have it in these three stages.*
2. *A: Yes, ma'am.*

There was an element of compulsion that could be seen in the supervisor's tone and the use of auxiliaries. The discourses show inequality in the way supervision was carried out. Since there was very little reaction by the supervisee on the issues raised by the supervisor, the supervisor took more space in discourses. Conversely, the supervisee became more quiet and submissive. This could also be explained as an element of fear in supervisee regarding making comments or asserting her position on any matter. The directness was mainly due to her command of the situation as a supervisor. Her command of English also added to her confidence level. Conversely, there were many ordeals for the supervisee: she had to manage the dialog in English as most of the time supervisor chose English as the language of communication; reciprocally, the supervisee also regarded that as the standard practice, and tried to be a member of English speaking group. This was a matter of identity also as the supervisee perceived English as the standard norm of communication in research and higher education contexts. Secondly, the supervisee possessed very limited research skills. This placed her in a further disenfranchised position. Supervisor taught the research skills during the consultations. Thus, there was genre mixing with teaching, with teaching taking a foreground of research consultations.

Generally, the extensive use of interruptions in a discourse between two competing interlocutors can lead to conflict, as interruptions denote power and control over discourses. According to Fairclough (1989), people with power can interrupt their subordinates without facing any serious repercussions. The supervisor interrupted the supervisee on a number of occasions, even in the little efforts of communication that the supervisee made. These interruptions were not meant to intimidate the supervisee consciously. Such interruptions came when there were a number of pauses in supervisee's responses. Their dialogs overlapped due to the intention of the supervisor to fill the gap in conversations.

1. A: *In National Qualification Framework in national qualification framework I went (pause of 10 seconds)*
2. S: *Did you do that?*
3. A: *In this details were coming so (again a pause of 10 seconds)*
4. S: *ok, that's good*
5. A: (overlap of speech) *I did that*

In case one, the supervisor used a number of declarative statements:

1. S: *I would say modifying the existing course...planning the course means that only*
2. *you planned it and decision making, which was a follow-up of this these five things,*
3. *ok?*

There were also imperatives with a tag question at the end like 'ok', 'alright', 'yeah?' These statements were both statements and questions. The speech function was to provide the information and to ask for confirmation. There was a strong link between declarative clauses and statements. The supervisor herself provided the rationale and

justification most of the time. There was very little room left for the supervisee to justify her work. In the interview, the supervisor expressed that she was convinced that the supervisee possessed very little research skills, and she tried to direct the way the research work should proceed. Bach and Harnish (1982:47) explain that directives “express the speaker’s attitude towards prospective action by the hearer,” and suggest different types of directive sub-classes: Requestive; requirement; prohibition; permissive and advisory. They also differentiate requestive and requirement acts by saying that whilst the former does not expect compliance on the part of the listener, the latter does. Also according to them, when speakers make a requirement speech act i.e. a speech act requiring the interlocutor to take some action, they are presuming that they have authority over the hearer. In case one there were requirement directives, asking for action from the supervisee in the form of commanding the course of action, demanding an action, directing the way forward, instructing how to go about writing the various parts of the thesis, prescribing the course of action and requiring a response.

There were also a number of negatives used in the text, in which the supervisor refused to accept the supervisee’s assertions:

S: “It’s not identifying resources....”

S: “It’s not coming out....”

S: “You have adapted it that’s why it’s not clear....”

S: “So it’s not identifying resources, this is not literature review, it’s not planning....”

S: “I don’t know what it is, this is not the purpose of the study”.

In these statements, there is an element of absoluteness in supervisor’s negation. There was a strong denial of aspects related to the supervisee’s understanding of research. The supervisor gave no space to the supervisee to defend her work or argue in its support. There was a single focused understanding of issues, which the supervisor regarded as final, as the focus of the discourse was on the research skills and the organization of contents. This aspect shows power play in the relationship between the partners. The supervisor was not ready to accept any explanation and the supervisee seemed to be so intimidated by the negation of her ideas that in these turns of dialogs she was particularly silent. The unequal relation between them resulted in the supervisor’s hegemonizing the consultations.

The supervisor also used a number of interrogatives. This was also ideational as the supervisor had the authority to ask a series of questions, because of her powerful presence. In the meetings, the supervisor used open-ended, close-ended and tag questions to elicit information. However, the supervisee rarely came up with longer stretches of explanation. She rather preferred to give very short replies, to questions like:

S: Why are you studying this?

S: Have you adapted this model?

S: Modified the course based on what?

S: What's this collection format?

Altogether, the grammatical moods built the style of discourses. Following Whorf's basic premise, grammatical organization is cultural, social like other aspects of social and cultural patterning (Blommaert 2006). Silverstein (1979; 2006) furthered that linguistic form is indexical, indexing context through ideological inferences: a particular form stands for a particular social and cultural meaning. There were co-textual context with its two parts: Grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion refers to the linkage of referring expressions. Grammatical cohesion in turn has three components, reference, substitution and ellipsis, (Cutting, 2002:13). In case one consultation meetings, there were lesser suggestions and most of the time it was either the denial of the supervisee's assertion or asking for clarification. There were lesser coherent devices used for meaning making than the questions asked by the supervisor. Ideologically, access to certain discourse type is ideological as it is granted to powerful agents in communication.

As compared to case one, in case two affirmatives and declaratives were used in the discourses of the supervisor, with lesser negatives and interrogatives. This created a mood of facilitation, mutuality and equality of both the participants. The supervisee could disagree, argue in favour of his ideas and could share his experiences freely with the supervisor:

1. *A: I am trying to sit for the whole evening and do five to six pages of transcription.*
2. *S: Oh that is too much. Like I used to take two pages per day and it came out well*

The supervisor used tag- questions, like *alright* or *ok* for confirmation. The texts were largely structured by narratives and explanations, comparing strategies of research adopted by other people and using one's critical thinking to decide which approach in research should be taken. The supervisor narrated an account about his own strife when he was doing PhD:

1. *She used to supervise Masters ... she used to always say*
2. *to me that I am a first born that is first born in PHD.... but she was very helpful but*
3. *there were many things that could not explain...*

This is a fibula story narrated in a particular way in his conversation, which is a series of logically and chronologically related events presented in a certain manner (Fairclough, 2000). The supervisor joined certain details of the account of his own supervisor, highlighting the idea that although she was new to the PhD program, she worked brilliantly and made him realize issues conceptually. Through his narrative, the supervisor set the precedence for the supervisee, to motivate the supervisee who sounded in low spirits in the early part of the meeting. This narrative was a combination of direct

and indirect reporting to create an impression of real events in his academic life from which he took inspiration.

What is notable in all these dialogs and turns of talk in case 2 was the level of comfort and informality used in the consultation meetings, which helped in putting the supervisee at ease, who was under a lot of stress of his work as well as his MS study. The research related issues were discussed with ease and flexibility of style. The way supervision was dealt in case two shows how important it was for this supervisor to build the supervisee's comfort level and to give him the space to think creatively and freely.

In case one there was an excessive use of 'I' & 'you' pronouns by both the participants. There was also an occasional use of 'we' and also 'they' in references to Pakistani teachers and students. The use of personal pronouns for the supervisee seemed quite direct. The gap in politeness could be explained through Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness where they talk about the relative power of the senior, which demands a high level of politeness from subordinates or students towards seniors or supervisors. In this context, while the use of personal pronouns may be appropriate from the senior, it may be perceived as unsuitable from the supervisee. However, as the familiarity index between the participants was high, this usage could be justified.

Contrastingly, in case two the personal pronouns "I" and "you" were largely used by the supervisor:

1. *S: I mean you cannot go exactly as per this, in it we will find that from the discourse unit only*

The supervisor used 'I' but also used 'we' instead of 'you' in many places. The tone was homogenous and democratic in giving instructions to the supervisee. The supervisee did not use personal pronouns with the supervisor and talked in general terms. This can be seen in the following dialogs:

1. *S: You have understood from their sentences. All these three things you pick and send*
2. *to them and say that you see this I have done correctly okay in that the benefit will be*
3. *this that if you don't send theirs.*
4. *A: Now those meanings have to be deciphered that same exercise. This is understood*
5. *through the themes.*

In case one, the lexical items related to technical vocabulary of ICT was used excessively in the text: *Video blogs, blended learning, teacher driven action research*, etc. This was the supervisee's domain and here the inherent power struggle could be seen where the supervisee was in the main or subject position and guided the supervisor. The discursive element of power was high in these exchanges where the supervisee's subject indicated her control on the topic. Lexical cohesion consisted of repetition, synonyms, superordinates and general words. Another item was the use of research language in

lexical items, such as *the purpose of the study, problem statement, rationale, survey, literature*, etc. Since the supervisor and supervisee constructed their domains where they were in powerful positions, their struggle for power was contested in very soft ways between them. Supervisor's domain was academic English, and by virtue of being an English language teacher throughout her career, her adherence was more towards language structure and writing skills.

1. S: *Then it's identifying , identifying resources, ohh okay/ now I got it alright so it's*
2. *identifying resources.*

The supervisee used an incorrect expression 'identify' instead of 'identifying' which created confusion. The supervisor shared in her interview that being an English language teacher, she was most attentive to such defects. The ideological base of such an assertion made the supervisor appear more powerful. Her English language skills were a strong aspect of her identity, which left the supervisee in a more disenfranchised position. The supervisee's domain was ICT and she tried to make her mark in her input, still it left her in a less powerful position. English has become one strong indicator of membership in lower, middle or upper class strata of Pakistani society. While a lack in English is interpreted as the low socio-economic levels and poor education standards, high socio-economic group is associated with better standards and elegant style of living: As a case in point, the supervisor's speech repertoire was rich, whereas the supervisee could use English in disjointed phrases.

Comparatively, in case two the participants' discourses were textured by lexical items pertaining to *knowledge*, such as *critical thinking, goals of education, research writing, thinking out of the box, and mainly by Islamic references and Muslim scholars*. The discourses and the lexical items largely differed in its orientation to Islamic lexis and knowledge based expressions. English was regarded a problem, a stigma in the discourse. As the supervisee expressed:

1. *A: I don't have the problem, how the mind has to be used and what is to be*
2. *done there is no problem in understanding this. I know that what is to be*
3. *done, what is not to be done, where is to organize what and for that after*
4. *sitting on the chair, after opening the laptop that comes in reading that*
5. *English isn't it. So yesterday I put extreme pressure on myself said that I will*
6. *open the computer and start.*

Ideologies related to language have a dominating role to play as people attribute efficiency or deficiency in work related tasks of language. In this way, language ideologies have a vital role to play in the lives of the people, as it was a limiting factor in the supervisee's case.

In terms of knowledge of organizing data, the goals of education could be seen. The supervisor repeatedly emphasized on a robust and in-depth analysis of the data to understand and make sense of the emerging themes, which link up with the research objectives and questions. In case two, the supervisor facilitated and encouraged the

supervisee to think critically and acquire meanings from the research data. The supervisor also showed his confidence in the supervisee's capability to carry out the task independently:

1. *S: okay so to answer number one you have done this done this thing when you do*
2. *Imam Ghazali then you will have another analysis, project done whatever, you draw*
3. *. Don't think it's a very difficult job. If you make a direct comparison, you will have*
4. *to do proper analysis of Imaam Ghazali... ."*
5. *A: Yes yes ok there is one thing that is occurring to me.*
6. *S: Sure, share it.*
7. *A: One thing that is occurring to me is that our ocus that there are nine interview*
8. *questions How will I link it to Imam Ghazali.*
9. *S: You see you have to read carefully and understand the philosophy of Imam*
10. *Ghazali and then think of your context and see what is possible to implement. In those*
11. *days it used to be like this that....You see you will use this in findings.*

Supervisor encouraged the supervisee to think critically about his research focus and analyze the data.

In case one internal relation of language structures were also absent in supervisee's discourses. It may be that the supervisor's command on English overwhelmed her, and she chose to be silent most of the time. According to Fairclough (1989), silence works as a tool for the lesser powerful as they can refrain from being corrected or checked. When the supervisee answered the queries of the supervisor, she spoke in disjointed structures with the subjects missing:

A: even more, to increase the font size?

A: because different types of blended learning

A: not working teaching, teachers not teaching through blended learning

The lack of paradigmatic features of the structural aspect of language in the supervisee's discourses made the supervisor appear in a more powerful frame. Silverstein's referential ideology of language has contributed in understanding language in its socio-cultural context. According to Blommaert (2005), the cause of linguistic and social inequality in society is because of the incompetence of the speaker to perform at a desirable level in society. The value and function of language are assessed and judged by the people. The linguistic difference or poor performance of people is regarded as inequalities between speakers. According to Bourdieu (1971) and Bernstein (1971), this explains any account of prestige and stigma in language. It also showed the social impact of inhibiting low performance which was ideological and which in turn affected the supervisor's talk. This is the instrumental ideology of language. For the supervisee, language did not serve as a tool for getting things done, that is, her work got delayed by excessive linguistic corrections made by the supervisor. The analysis also revealed the supervisee's

acceptance of supervisor's control and authority. This aspect made the whole text ideological with the strong hegemonic role of the powerful.

On the other hand, the case two consultations were marked by its facilitation to the supervisee through the techniques of genre mixing with narration, argumentation and relationships of compare and contrast and cause and effect.

1. *S: I had gone out of the way to uhhh give credibility to my research so that is what I*
2. *believe and that is what I think I mean this is what my approach is. I would like my*
3. *students, uhh uhh my supervisees to have a very reliable research / a thorough*
4. *research*

With these statements, the supervisor laid the stage of his interview. There were continuous references to three aspects during his interview. The first was a criticism of structuredness of thesis writing, and English was equated to structured norms in writing; the other reference was a positive one, related to knowledge aspect; and the third strong reference was related to Islamic education. It would be discerning to note that while its structured aspect had a negative import, knowledge and Islamic education had positive connotations in the text.

The data shows genre mixing with argumentation. In the following excerpts, the genre mixing could be seen:

1. *S: I had problem. It is actually how you take it. You have to think positively and that*
2. *is the key to your success.*

The data shows genre mixing with narration. This narration also mixes genres with compare and contrast and cause and effect relationship:

1. *S: I had a supervisor. When I went on a plane now I am writing to him he is not*
2. *replying. I found out that he had left and gone. I had a co-supervisor, from her*
3. *then I remotely requested that you become my supervisor*

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The paper concludes with the proposition that the voice of the research supervisee was not heard in case one, while in case two the participant was given encouragement through strategies devised by the supervisor. This affected their level of participation during the consultations. The case one discourse of the participants was largely affected by the institutional structure and control, which influenced the supervision practices and gave them a highly structured form. Language was a major concern in the consultation meetings, which became a source of establishing asymmetrical power relations between the participants. Class struggle in social relations affected the discourses. The non-egalitarian layer of power manifested itself through language ideologies, as language became a source of creating classes among the people. Language ideologies played a very

important role in sustaining the dominant position of the powerful agent. The non-verbal communication also displayed the soft power of the dominant partner. The voice of the supervisee was silent on many occasions. The study's submission is that language played a vital role in constraining the contributions of the less powerful participant, and was a source of creating inequality and incapacity to achieve desired goals.

Based on the research findings and discussion of the themes, the study presents the recommendations for bringing about a change in research supervision. The study recommends that the supervisors should not consider English language as a criterion for communication in research consultation meetings. As most of the students are not proficient in English language skills, they tend to shy away in the meetings. Development at the conceptual level would bring depth and profundity in research, which is getting compromised in most of the research supervisions. The supervisees should be encouraged to get involved in philosophical debates and discussions at the conceptual levels of the research, rather than being limited by the superficial factors of language. A pluralistic approach should be adopted where not one language but bilingualism or national language should also be encouraged

References

- Bach, K. & Harnish, K. (1982). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). Class, codes and control. *Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language*, 1
- Blommaert, J.(2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Boltanski, L. (1971). Maledier, La défense du corps. *Social Science Information*, 10(4). 45–86.
- Carreira, J. M. (2011). Relationship between motivation for learning EFL and intrinsic motivation for learning in general among Japanese elementary school students. *System*, 39 (1), 90-102.
- Cazden, C. B., John, V. P., & Hymes, D. (1972). *Functions of language in the classroom*. Oxford, England: Columbia University Press.
- Clughen, L., & Connell, M. (2012). Writing and resistance: Reflections on the practice of embedding writing in the curriculum. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 11(4), 333-345.
- Cohen, M. (1993). Listening to students' voices: What university students tell us about how they can learn. Paper to Annual Meeting of AERA: Atlanta, GA.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A metaanalytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) (2000). *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning. Design of social futures*. Routledge, London.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Devos, C., Van der Linden, N., Boudrenghien, G., Azzi, A., Frenay, M., Galand, B., & Klein, O. (2015). Doctoral supervision in the light of the three types of support

- promoted in self-determination theory. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 10, 438-464.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Flores, S. Y., & Murillo, E. G. (2001). Power, language, and ideology: Historical and contemporary notes on the dismantling of bilingual education. *The Urban Review*, 33(3), 183-206.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivanic, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of writer identity*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin.
- Javed, F. (2017). A historical perspective of Pakistan's language in education policy. *Language in India* 17 (8).
- Lea, M., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Lea, M. (1998). Academic literacies and learning in higher education: Constructing knowledge texts and experience. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 30(2), 156-171.
- Lea, M. (1994). I thought I could write until I came here: Student writing in higher education. *Improving Student Learning: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: OCSA.
- Levinson, S. (2005). *Information. Theoretic Analysis of Speech Communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. 143-156.
- Lillis, T. (2001). Student writing as academic literacies: Drawing on Bakhtin (1986a) to move from critique to design. *Language and education*, 17(3), 192-207.
- Luykx, A., Lee, O., Mahotiere, M., Lester, B., Hart, J., & Deaktor, R. (2008). Cultural and home language influences on children's responses to science assessments. *Teachers College Record*, 109(4), 897-926.
- Maxwell T.W. & Smyth, R. (2011). Higher degree research supervision: from practice toward theory. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30 (2), 219-231. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2010.509762.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mori, J. (2014). Border crossings? Exploring the intersection of second language acquisition, conversation analysis, and foreign language pedagogy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(1), 849-862.
- Rassool, N. (2007). Global issues in language, education and development: Perspectives from postcolonial countries. *Multilingual Matters*. Clevedon: Ltd
- Razzaq, J., & Forde, C. (2014). The management of large-scale change in Pakistani education. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, 34 (3)
- Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist*, 44, 159-178.
- Rogers, R., & Christian, J. (2007). What could I say? A critical discourse analysis of the construction of race in children's literature. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10 (1), 21-46. framework, *Research Papers in Education*, 31:2, 212-233, DOI: 10.1080/02671522.2015.1027726
- Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28 (3), 235-249.

- Stierer, B. (1997). *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education: Theories, practices and model*. UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Street, B. V. (2000). Literacy events and literacy practices: Theory and practice in the new literacy studies. In K. Jones and M. Martin-Jones (Eds.) *Multilingual Literacies. Reading and Writing Different Worlds*.
- Street, B. V. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy development, ethnography and education*. London: Longman.
- Tuck, J. (2010). An exploration of subject tutor practice surrounding student writing in UK higher education. In *Writing Development in Higher Education Conference*.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C. P., & Soenens, B. (2010). The development of the five mini-theories of self-determination theory: An historical overview, emerging trends, and future directions. In T. C. Urdan & S. A. Karabenick (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement. The decade ahead: Theoretical perspectives on motivation and achievement*, 105-165. London: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Vehviläinen, S., & Löfström, E. (2016). I wish I had a crystal ball: Discourses and potentials for developing academic supervising. *Studies in higher Education*, 41, (3), 508-524.
- Volk, D., & Angelova, M. (2007). Language ideology and the mediation of language choice in peer interactions in a dual-language first grade. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 6 (3), 177-199.
- Weibel, A., & Six, F. E. (2013). Trust and control: the role of intrinsic motivation. In R. Bachmann and A. Zaheer (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in trust research*, 57-81. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.